

Quantum simulation of Hamiltonian spectra on a silicon chip

R. Santagati^{1†*}, J. Wang^{1†}, A. A. Gentile¹, S. Paesani¹, N. Wiebe^{2*}, J. R. McClean³, S. R. Morley-Short^{1,4}, P. J. Shadbolt⁵, D. Bonneau¹, J. W. Silverstone¹, D. P. Tew⁶, X. Zhou⁷, J. L. O'Brien¹ and M. G. Thompson^{1*}

¹ Quantum Engineering Technology Labs, H. H. Wills Physics Laboratory and Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University of Bristol, BS8 1FD, UK

² Quantum Architectures and Computation Group, Microsoft Research, Redmond, Washington 98052, USA

³ Computational Research Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

⁴ Quantum Engineering Centre for Doctoral Training, H. H. Wills Physics Laboratory and Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University of Bristol, Tyndall Avenue, BS8 1FD, United Kingdom

⁵ Department of Physics, Imperial College London, London, SW7 2AZ, UK

⁶ School of Chemistry, University of Bristol, Bristol BSB 1TS, United Kingdom

⁷ State Key Laboratory of Optoelectronic Materials and Technologies and School of Physics, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, China

[†] These authors contributed equally to this work.

* e-mails: raffaele.santagati@bristol.ac.uk, nawiebe@microsoft.com, mark.thompson@bristol.ac.uk

Abstract: The efficient calculation of Hamiltonian spectra, a problem largely intractable on classical machines, promises to revolutionise many fields, from physics to chemistry. We propose and demonstrate a new quantum approach to make ground and excited-states experimentally accessible by introducing the concept of an "eigenstate witness", which has no direct analogue in classical algorithms. Combining favourable aspects of quantum variational methods and quantum phase estimation, this approach further enhances the accuracy in the eigenvalues calculation without additional costs. We experimentally verify this protocol on a programmable silicon quantum photonic chip, a mass-manufacturable platform, which embeds entangled state generation, arbitrary controlled-unitary operations and projective measurements. Both ground and excited-states are experimentally found with fidelities $> 99\%$, and their eigenvalues are estimated with a 32-bits precision. Furthermore, we investigate the scalability of our approach by performing numerical simulations for more complex Hamiltonians. This result shows a new, promising tool for the implementation of quantum simulation on quantum computers.

Introduction

The simulation of quantum mechanical systems, using conventional classical methods, requires resources which grow exponentially with the size of the system. Since Feynman's seminal proposal [1], efficient algorithms for quantum simulation have followed [2, 3], and many demonstrations have been reported in different physical systems [4–17]. Calculating the spectrum of a given Hamiltonian is a fundamental problem of widespread applicability, necessary for example to understand reaction rates in quantum chemistry. In particular, characterization of excited-states is required to study energy and charge transfer processes such as those in bulk heterojunction solar cells or photosynthetic light harvesting complexes [18, 19]. These kinds of problems are hard for classical computers, yet are expected to be tractable with quantum computers in some instances [2, 3].

Given an approximate eigenstate, the quantum phase estimation algorithm (QPEA) can efficiently estimate the corresponding eigenvalue. A more practical version, the iterative phase estimation algorithm (IPEA) [20, 21], has been demonstrated using different quantum hardware, such as nuclear magnetic resonance, photonic and superconducting sys-

tems [12–14]. In order to prepare the input eigenstates, adiabatic state preparation has been proposed as a scalable solution [3], at the cost of expensive state preparation and deep circuits, making it unsuitable for near-term implementations on quantum computers. Variational quantum eigensolvers (VQE) using a hybrid quantum-classical approach, were designed to address these shortcomings [15, 22]. In addition, they are believed to have unique robustness to error in finding the ground-state and its eigenvalue [13, 23]. They are, however, quadratically less precise than QPEA, as they rely on sampling for the energy estimation in the original formulation. More importantly, variational methods so far could *only* target ground-states. A linear response methodology or a spectrum folding method have been proposed as possible solutions [15, 23]. However, though the linear response methodology maintains the low coherence time advantages of the original VQE, it requires additional sampling measurements and cannot refine approximate excited-states. The spectrum folding method instead requires a quadratic increase in the number of terms of the effective Hamiltonian and consequently in the cost of the procedure. These issues so far have limited previous experimental demonstrations to finding only ground-states, despite the practical importance of excited ones.




Figure 1: **The WAVES protocol.** (a) Flowchart describing the protocol. The optimisation of $\mathcal{F}_{obj}(\vec{\theta}) = \mathcal{E} + T\mathcal{S}$ using the circuit in (b) allows one to variationally find the ground-state of the Hamiltonian, preparing trial states via the ansatz $\hat{A}(\vec{\theta})$ with no perturbation ($\hat{E}_{p_0} = \hat{I}$). An initial guess for an excited-state is given by a perturbation $\hat{E}_{p_i}$ on the ground-state, and then refined using the same circuit, by exploiting the eigenstate witness $\mathcal{F}_{obj}(\vec{\theta}) = \mathcal{S}$ (high- T limit). For each target eigenstate found, the eigenvalues are precisely estimated via the iterative phase estimation algorithm (IPEA), using the quantum logic circuit in (c). The colour coding in b and c, blue for the control and red for the target refers to the difference in wavelength between the photon in the control qubit and the one in the target register, in our experimental implementation. (d) Diagram representing schematically the intuition behind the proposed approach, where initial guesses of excited states are variationally refined using the witness and IPEA returns the eigenvalues.

In this work, we propose a new method which can be used to overcome this limitation, experimentally use it in a proof of principle demonstration to find both ground and excited-states of a simplified exciton transfer Hamiltonian and test its performances through numerical simulations on higher dimensional Hamiltonians. A key concept for the implementation of this approach is the “*eigenstate witness*”. This quantity allows us to variationally find the eigenstate closest to an initial guess. The witness we propose is based on an efficient estimation of the entropy acquired by a quantum register, whose time evolution is controlled by an ancillary qubit. This approach takes advantage of an intrinsically quantum property of the system and has no known classical analogue. In order to implement the algorithm we developed a two-qubit quantum photonic processor on the silicon photonic platform [24–31]. This device embeds the key functionalities of on-chip entangled states generation [26, 27, 32], tomography [28, 29] and arbitrary controlled-unitary operations ($\hat{C}\hat{U}$). In order to perform the latter we exploited an entanglement-based scheme [33, 34] – used here for the first realisation of an arbitrary $\hat{C}\hat{U}$ operation in integrated quantum photonics.

Results

The WAVES protocol. Our approach, witness-assisted variational eigenspectra solver (WAVES), combines favourable aspects of VQE and QPEA. It is divided into three main steps (see Fig. 1a): *i*) an ansatz-based variational search for the ground-state, *ii*) a witness-assisted variational search for excited-states, starting with an initial guess obtained from the ground-state reference, and *iii*) an IPEA for the accurate energy estimate of the found eigenstates. Different types of ansatz have been proposed for the variational search, among them, unitary coupled-cluster (UCC) is thought to be one of the most promising for quantum chemistry problems [15, 22, 35].

The quantum logic circuits for WAVES are shown in Fig. 1b and Fig. 1c. The search (Fig. 1b) proceeds by preparing trial states $|\Psi\rangle_T$ in the target register, according to the ansatz, and setting the control qubit to $|+\rangle_C$. The $\hat{C}\hat{U}$ operation embeds the unitary $\hat{U} = e^{-i\hat{H}t}$ for the evolution of $|\Psi\rangle_T$ according to the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$. The control qubit state $\rho_C = \text{Tr}_T(\rho)$ can be found from single-qubit state tomography, allowing the calculation of the Von Neumann entropy $\mathcal{S}(\rho_T) = \mathcal{S}(\rho_C)$. Entropy acts as an *eigenstate witness*: it is zero if the target state is an eigenstate of the Hamiltonian. In particular, in SI

Section 2 we show that for small t the Von Neumann entropy, along with the linear entropy, are upper and lower bounded by monotonic functions of the support of $|\Psi\rangle$ in the eigen-basis of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$, i.e. they are sensible measures of the support.

This measurement of the entropy enables us to variationally target excited-states as well as the ground-state. The control qubit also provides an energy estimator $\mathcal{E} = -\text{Arg}[\langle\Psi|e^{-i\hat{\mathcal{H}}t}|\Psi\rangle_T]/t$, evaluated using the off-diagonal elements of ρ_C . The variationally optimal ground-state simultaneously minimises the entropy $\mathcal{S}(\rho_C)$ and the energy estimate $\mathcal{E}$. Computationally, the task of finding the ground-state can be interpreted as an optimisation problem using a physically motivated objective function $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$ analogous to a *free energy*, $\mathcal{E} + T\mathcal{S}(\rho_C) = \mathcal{E} - T \text{Tr}[\rho_C \ln(\rho_C)]$, where the parameter T is analogous to temperature. We call $\mathcal{P} = \text{Tr}[\rho_C^2]$ the purity of the reduced density matrix of the control qubit, and approximate the von Neumann entropy with the linear entropy $1 - \mathcal{P}$ in order to use the more practical objective function:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{E} - T\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{E} - T \text{Tr}[\rho_C^2], \quad (1)$$

up to negligible constants. The optimisation of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$ also permits one to identify excited-states, since they occupy local minima in the high T limit. Defining an initial reference state $|\Phi\rangle$ (usually obtained by mean-field approximations) and the complex vector $\vec{\theta}$ as the list of parameters describing the ansatz-based state preparation $\hat{A}(\vec{\theta})$, i.e. $|\Psi\rangle_T = \hat{A}(\vec{\theta})|\Phi\rangle$ for example according to UCC, our algorithm proceeds as follows:

1. Variationally search for the state parameters $\vec{\theta}_g$ that minimize the objective function $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$, thus obtaining the unitary for the ground-state $\hat{A}_g = \hat{A}(\vec{\theta}_g)$.
2. Construct a unitary for an approximate i^{th} target excited-state via $\hat{E}_{p_i}\hat{A}(\vec{\theta})$, starting from the initial guess $\vec{\theta} = \vec{\theta}_g$, with $\hat{E}_{p_i}$ a system dependent perturbation. Variationally search for the $\vec{\theta}_{e_i}$ that minimises $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$ in the high T limit (entropy), obtaining the unitary for the target excited-state $\hat{A}_{e_i} = \hat{E}_{p_i}\hat{A}(\vec{\theta}_{e_i})$.
3. Perform IPEA to refine the energy for the ground and excited-states, using $\hat{A}_g$ and $\hat{A}_{e_i}$ in the state preparation.

Consistent choices for the system and state-specific perturbing unitaries $\hat{E}_{p_i}$, required to construct the excited-states, can be inferred from readily computable properties of the simulated system [23]. General many-body Hamiltonians for interacting particles decompose into $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}$, where $\hat{H}_0 = \sum_i \epsilon_i \hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_i$ is a one-particle term and $\hat{V}$ is an interaction term. Since $\hat{H}_0$ dominates $\hat{H}$, a transition from the ground-state to an excited-state can be approximated by the action of a sequence of single excitation operators $\hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_j$, each with a corresponding unitary $\hat{E}_p = \exp[\pi/2(\hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_j - \hat{a}_j^\dagger \hat{a}_i)]$. If excitation operators that are based on the Hartree-Fock

approximation do not provide sufficient accuracy, then alternative approximations can be used. Advanced methods such as multi-configuration self-consistent-field (MCSCF) approximations [36] may ultimately be needed for hard instances with substantial electron correlations. We discuss how post-Hartree-Fock methods can be used to tackle these problems through the use of natural orbitals in SI 7.

Silicon quantum photonic chip and experimental setup. The experimental demonstration of WAVES was performed on a two-qubit silicon quantum photonic processor schematically described in Fig. 2. The device is fabricated via deep-UV lithography on a silicon-on-insulator (SOI) wafer with $450 \text{ nm} \times 220 \text{ nm}$ single-mode waveguides. A continuous-wave (CW) pump laser in the telecom C-band with an off-chip power of approximately 10 mW is coupled into the chip using polymer spot-size converters and lensed-fibres, with a facet loss of approximately 8 dB. Pairs of single photons are generated in two 1.2-cm-long waveguide spiral sources through spontaneous four-wave mixing (SFWM) [25, 26]. Output photons are filtered using arrayed waveguide gratings (AWG) with a 0.9 nm bandwidth, spectrally selecting signal photons (blue) for the control qubit and idler ones (red) for the target. The photons are detected by superconducting nanowire single-photon detectors (SNSPDs) with approximately 85% efficiency, obtaining a maximum photon coincidence rate of $\approx 150 \text{ Hz}$. No substantial Raman scattering was observed. Optical interferometers consisting of thermo-optic phase shifters and multi-mode interferometer (MMI) beam-splitters are used for photonic qubit manipulation and analysis, driven by an electronic controller with 12-bit digital-to-analogue converters. The automation for the WAVES algorithm, including the control of quantum gates, the data collection and real-time analysis, are realised by a classical computer interfaced with the quantum photonic chip. More experimental details in SI Section 1.

Because of the low power CW pump employed in our experiment, multi-photon terms can be safely neglected. The use of the two spiral sources generates the Fock state $(|20\rangle + |02\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. High-visibility two-photon quantum interference ($\mathcal{V}_{\text{qua}} = 1.00 \pm 0.02$) was observed in this experimental setup, as shown in the inset of Fig. 2. The photons are probabilistically split by two MMIs and then swapped by a waveguide crossing, yielding the maximally path-entangled state $(|1010\rangle + |0101\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ in the Fock basis [28, 29]. The state of the target photon is then expanded by adding two optical spatial modes. These additional modes represent the two components of the target qubit, which is prepared in $|\Psi\rangle_T$ for both paths and undergoes an arbitrary $\hat{U}$. That is, the operation performed on the target qubit — either $\hat{I}$ or $\hat{U}$ — depends on which path the photon is travelling on, indicated by $|0\rangle_P$ or $|1\rangle_P$. Path, in turn, is controlled by the state of the control qubit (the two qubits are entangled), $|0\rangle_C$ or $|1\rangle_C$,




Figure 2: **Silicon quantum photonic processor.** The quantum device enables one to produce maximally path-entangled photon states, perform arbitrary single-qubit state preparation and projective measurements, and more importantly perform any $C\hat{U}$ operation in the two-dimensional space. Photons are guided in the waveguides and controlled by thermo-optical phase shifters. Photon pairs are directly generated inside the silicon spiral sources through SFWM, off-chip filtered by AWG filters (not shown), and measured by SNSPDs. The generated signal (blue) and idler (red) photons are different in wavelength, and form the control and target qubits, respectively. The quantum chip is interfaced with a classical computer. Inset: high-visibility quantum (blue) and classical (green) interference fringes obtained in the device using the photon sources part and configuring the top final interferometer. The high visibility is essential to verify the high-performance and correct characterisation of the device.

which yields a superposition of $\hat{I}$ and $\hat{U}$ gates in the circuit:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_C \otimes \hat{I}|\Psi\rangle_T \otimes |0\rangle_P + |1\rangle_C \otimes \hat{U}|\Psi\rangle_T \otimes |1\rangle_P). \quad (2)$$

By erasing the path information with the use of an additional waveguide crossing and two final MMIs and by detecting the signal photon and idler photon, we obtain the controlled unitary $C\hat{U}$ operation [33, 34]

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_C \otimes \hat{I}|\Psi\rangle_T + |1\rangle_C \otimes \hat{U}|\Psi\rangle_T). \quad (3)$$

Note that this approach implements the $C\hat{U}$ gate without decomposing it into multiple two-qubit gates [14]. The state preparation is realised by $\hat{A} = e^{i\phi_a} e^{i\phi_b \hat{\sigma}_z/2} e^{i\phi_c \hat{\sigma}_y/2}$ operations, while the $\hat{U}$ used to map the Hamiltonian is obtained by $\hat{U} = e^{i\phi_c \hat{\sigma}_z/2} e^{i\phi_d \hat{\sigma}_y/2} e^{i\phi_e \hat{\sigma}_z/2}$, where ϕ_i are phases applied by on-chip thermal phase-shifters (more details in SI Section 1). The realisation of $|\Psi\rangle_T$ and $\hat{U}$ are physically separated and

can be independently manipulated by the on-chip parameters (see Fig. 2). The control qubit undergoes another single-qubit operation that can be used to perform the required operations both for tomography and for the IPEA.

Experimental results. We used the quantum optical chip to perform WAVES, calculating the eigenspectrum of a simplified exciton transfer Hamiltonian of two Chlorophyll units in the 18-mer ring of the LHII complex. The Hamiltonian is parametrized by $\alpha \simeq 1.46$ eV, the exciton energy of a single chlorophyll unit, and $\beta \simeq 0.037$ eV, the coupling strength between the two units [37]. This 2×2 Hamiltonian is written as $\hat{\mathcal{H}} = (\alpha - \ell)\hat{I} + \beta\hat{\sigma}_x$, in the basis of Pauli operators [22], where ℓ is a reference energy that can be chosen arbitrarily (see SI 8.1). For this Hamiltonian the perturbing unitary for the excited-state corresponds to $\hat{E}_p = e^{i\pi\hat{\sigma}_z/2}$.

In Fig. 3 we show the experimental results of the WAVES approach for the ground and excited-state search. We adopt a swarm optimisation method for the minimization of the ob-




Figure 3: Experimental results. A Hamiltonian representing a single-exciton transfer between two chlorophyll units is implemented on the silicon quantum photonic device for an experimental test of the protocol. (a) and (b) Colour-coded evolution of the particle swarm for the WAVES search of the ground-state ($|-\rangle$) and excited-state ($|+\rangle$) shown on the Bloch spheres. Different colours correspond to different steps of the search protocol. (c) and (d) Evolution of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$ for the ground-state search and the excited-state search. (e) and (f) Convergence of the fidelity towards the ground-state and the excited-state, resulting in a final fidelity ($F = |\langle \Psi | \Psi_{\text{ideal}} \rangle|^2$) of $99.48 \pm 0.28\%$ and $99.95 \pm 0.05\%$ respectively. Error bars are given by the variance of the particles distribution and photon Poissonian noise. Dashed lines are numerical simulations of the performance of the algorithm, averaged over 1000 runs, with shaded areas representing one s.d. confidence interval. Insets: behaviour close to convergence. (g) and (h) Normalised photon coincidences used to calculate the 32 IPEA-estimated bits of the eigenphase for both eigenstates. The theoretical bit value is reported above each bar. Errors arising from Poissonian noise are reported as shaded areas on the bars.

jective function, where for each iteration $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$ is measured for a swarm of trial states (*particles*), randomly sampled from a prior distribution, and used to infer a posterior with lower $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$ (see SI 3). In Figs. 3a, b we report color-coded evolution of the swarm, achieving rapid convergence of the particle distribution towards the expected eigenstates of the Hamiltonian: the ground-state $|-\rangle$ and the first excited-state $|+\rangle$. For the ground-state search, pessimistically assuming no pre-existing knowledge of the system, the prior is initialised to span uniformly the sub-section of the Hilbert space identified by the ansatz. For the excited-state, instead, the search is initialised with the guessed state obtained by applying $\hat{E}_p$ to the ground-state.

As shown in Figs. 3c, d, within 10-13 search steps the $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$ is converging well to its minimal value, which is corresponding to the ground-state and excited-state, respectively. Figs. 3e, f report that the mean of the particles distribution achieves a high overlap with the eigenstate targeted: fidelity of $99.48 \pm 0.28\%$ with the ground-state and $99.95 \pm 0.05\%$ with the excited one. All uncertainties are given by the variance of the prior distributions: a well motivated error bar is among the amenable features deriving from the adoption of a swarm optimisation method.

The successful convergence of $|\Psi\rangle_T$ is achieved by optimizing the $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$ function. In particular, for the ground-state search we used $T = 1.25$ in $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$, as motivated in SI 4, while for the excited-state case we used $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}} \equiv -\mathcal{P}$, i.e. large- T limit. Imperfect measurements of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$, more evident in the regime close to convergence, are due mainly to experimental noise in the phase settings, given by residual thermal cross-talk among the phase-shifters. The fast convergence of the algorithm, however, indicates a good robustness of the protocol to this kind of experimental noise. Error resilience is a particularly useful feature in the ground-state search, where the limited initial knowledge of the target state may require spanning a bigger portion of the Hilbert space. In this case an objective function using two figures of merit as in Eq. 1 seems to add robustness against noise (see SI 4.2).

After the eigenstate search, the WAVES algorithm embeds the IPEA to improve the accuracy of eigenvalues estimate [3, 14]. In our implementation we took advantage of the circuit reconfigurability, mapping each $\hat{U}^{2^k}$ directly into the chip parameters (Fig.1.c). However, in universal quantum computers, $\hat{U}^k$ can be efficiently achieved without classical pre-compilation by cascading k copies of $\hat{U}$ [13]. The IPEA estimated the binary fraction expansion of the eigenphase $\varphi(\text{mod } 2\pi)$ for both the ground and excited-state energies up to 32 bits (i.e. a precision of 2.9×10^{-9} eV). The normalised photon counts are reported in Figs. 3g, h for all the 32 bits. Such precision is higher than what is typically achievable by spectroscopic methods.

Numerical results for high-dimensional systems. We complement these proof of principle experimental results

with a set of numerical simulations, providing insight into the performance of our approach when applied to more complex systems. It is in fact important to study the resilience of WAVES against local minima in the objective function $\mathcal{F}_{\text{obj}}$, which are expected to have a stronger effect for higher dimensional Hamiltonians. For our numerical tests, we chose a set of molecular Hydrogen systems (H_2 , H_3^+ , H_3 and H_4), described adopting the STO-3G basis in the Jordan-Wigner representation, see SI 8.2. The corresponding Hamiltonians are represented by up to 8 qubits and exhibit several degeneracies in the spectrum. Therefore, for each set of degenerate excited-states we will refer generically to the “excited *subspace*” they span.

Figs. 4a,b report the simulation results for the ground-state search and some exemplary excited-states searches, respectively, addressing the latter ones with a set of excitation operators of the form $\hat{E}_{p_i}$. Truncated parametrised-Hamiltonian ansätze $\hat{A}'$ were here used to test the convergence of the algorithm in cases where only limited knowledge on the physical system is available. Each $\hat{A}'$ is obtained dropping from the original ansatz $\hat{A}$ those terms corresponding to the smallest values $|\theta_g|$ preliminarily obtained. Further details about this synthetic ansatz-truncation scheme can be found in SI Section 9.1, along with comparative results obtained from the corresponding untruncated and UCCSD ansätze. To stress the resilience of WAVES to a poor initial guess for the parameters, all the simulations in Fig. 4a were performed assuming no *a priori* knowledge of optimal $\vec{\theta}$, i.e. the initial guess $\hat{A}(\vec{\theta}_0)|\Phi\rangle \equiv |\Phi\rangle$. For all the cases investigated here, WAVES is able to consistently find both the ground and excited-states. Fidelities of approximately 95% are achieved, even for cases where an impoverished ansatz is adopted and consequently the initial guess retained only small overlap with the targeted excited-state.

Discussion

We developed the witness-assisted variational eigenspectra solver. In order to study the eigenspectrum of a Hamiltonian describing a simplified exciton transfer process, the WAVES algorithm was implemented using a silicon quantum photonic chip. High-quality of the device together with its accurate control enable the verification of the protocol, showing that WAVES can retrieve ground and excited eigenstates with high fidelities ($F > 0.99$) and can calculate the corresponding eigenvalues up to spectroscopic accuracy. This proof of principle experimental demonstration suggests the amenability of our algorithm for realistic near-term implementations and additional evidence is provided by numerical simulations, indicating how WAVES is capable of yielding eigenstate estimates with high fidelity for Hamiltonians up to 8 qubits. As we increase the dimensionality of the system, it is known how finding an accurate variational ansatz becomes more difficult.




Figure 4: **Numerical simulations for high-dimensional Hamiltonians.** The cases studied refer to molecular Hydrogen systems (H_2 , H_3^+ , H_3 , H_4) with the synthetically truncated parametrised-Hamiltonian ansatz. (a) Variational search for the ground-state. (b) Variational search for the targeted subspace of degenerate excited-states with initial excitation perturbation $\hat{E}_{p_i}$. The average fidelities achieved by the particle swarm optimisation are calculated for 100 independent runs of WAVES. Dashed lines reports average fidelities with the shaded areas indicating 67.5% confidence intervals. On the x-axis we refer to the cumulative number of trial states probed, i.e. the number of particles in the swarm times the variational steps. For ease of comparison, the x-axis origin has been shifted in (a) for the various cases in order to have equivalent fidelity for the average initial guess. In all simulations a binomial noise model has been taken into account when performing projective measurements.

Therefore, a scenario of synthetically inaccurate ansätze was analysed performing truncations of the original ansatz. This strategy allowed performance investigations of the algorithm for a wide variety of cases (further outlined in SI 9), without the scaling being obscured by ansätze whose accuracy depends on the system dimensionality.

WAVES offers key improvements over previous protocols. First, it locates excited-states with a quantum method and without the need of precise knowledge of the spectral gap. Furthermore, it introduces an eigenstate witness that may provide an independent test of the protocol’s success, detecting failure cases of convergence to local optima that do not represent a single eigenstate nor excited subspace. These advantages come at the cost of controlling the evolution of the target register with an ancillary qubit, which is avoidable in previous VQE proposals. Also, in WAVES, the ability to finding specific eigenstates relies on the quality of the excitation operators and ansatz. Further optimisation on the objective function, e.g. including the use of an energy penalty, can in principle overcome some of these limitations.

The states found using the variational search, both in the experiments and in the numerical simulations, exhibited high fidelities with the target eigenstates. This preliminary refinement provides QPEA with an improved approximation of the target eigenstate, leading to an exponentially higher success

probability in estimating the corresponding eigenvalue and reducing the overall complexity. Furthermore, the use of QPEA gives a quadratic speed-up compared to VQE in estimating the energy within a chosen precision. Such advantages are significant given the high accuracy required in quantum chemical applications [35]. Therefore, they were a decisive factor in favour of embedding QPEA as a final phase of the WAVES protocol.

In addition to the QPEA bootstrapping, another valuable advantage is inherited from variational approaches. Learning the optimal parameters not only provides us with a method to prepare copies of approximate targeted eigenstates, but may bring insights on the state properties [15]. In WAVES, this advantage naturally extends from the ground-state also to excited-states.

Finally, in terms of computational cost, WAVES does not require an increase in the number of terms of the implemented Hamiltonian (unlike the spectral folding method) nor lengthy adiabatic preparation of targeted eigenstates [3, 12, 22], and is able to refine excited-states on the quantum device in a purely variational manner, in contrast to quantum-classical linear response methods [23]. The scalability of the approach is formally addressed in SI Section 5, where we analytically estimate its complexity to scale polynomially with the cardinality of the ansatz parametrisation.

Conclusions

Introducing the concept of an eigenstate witness, we experimentally demonstrate a new approach which tackles the search for both ground and excited states. Our algorithm is in principle amenable to short circuit depths and leverages on methods known to exhibit error robustness, thus enabling near-term experiments on non-fault tolerant machines. The method can be run on any digital quantum hardware, e.g. linear-optics [38], superconducting [39], trapped ions [40] and solid-state [41] systems. The validity of the approach and its performances have been tested both experimentally and through numerical simulations, which gave encouraging results for its scalability and near-term applicability to solve useful quantum simulation problems. Developing new objective functions for variational algorithms, this protocol opens the way to the investigation of more effective methods for computing Hamiltonian spectra, and represents a promising tool for future implementations of quantum simulation on quantum computers.

References

1. R. P. Feynman. Simulating physics with computers. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **21**, 467–488 (1982).
2. S. Lloyd. Universal quantum simulators. *Science* **273**, 1073–1078 (1996).
3. A. Aspuru-Guzik, A. Dutoi, M. Head-Gordon, P. J. Love & P. Love. Simulated quantum computation of molecular energies. *Science* **309**, 1704–1707 (2005).
4. A. Aspuru-Guzik & P. Walther. Photonic quantum simulators. *Nature Phys.* **8**, 285–291 (2012).
5. I. Bloch, J. Dalibard & S. Nascimbène. Quantum simulations with ultracold quantum gases. *Nature Phys.* **8**, 267–276 (2012).
6. R. Blatt & C. F. Roos. Quantum simulations with trapped ions. *Nature Phys.* **8**, 277–284 (Apr. 2012).
7. A. A. Houck, H. E. Türeci & J. Koch. On-chip quantum simulation with superconducting circuits. *Nature Phys.* **8**, 292–299 (2012).
8. K. Kim *et al.* Quantum simulation of frustrated Ising spins with trapped ions. *Nature* **465**, 590–593 (2010).
9. B. P. Lanyon *et al.* Universal digital quantum simulation with trapped ions. *Science* **334**, 57–61 (2011).
10. K. R. Brown, R. J. Clark & I. L. Chuang. Limitations of quantum simulation examined by simulating a pairing Hamiltonian using nuclear magnetic resonance. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 050504 (2006).
11. M. Neeley *et al.* Emulation of a quantum spin with a superconducting phase qubit. *Science* **325**, 722–725 (2009).
12. J. Du *et al.* NMR implementation of a molecular hydrogen quantum simulation with adiabatic state preparation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 030502 (2010).
13. P. J. J. O’Malley *et al.* Scalable quantum simulation of molecular energies. *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 031007 (2016).
14. B. P. Lanyon, J. Whitfield, J. D. Whitfield, G. Gillett & M. Goggin. Towards quantum chemistry on a quantum computer. *Nature Chem.* (2010).
15. A. Peruzzo *et al.* A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor. *Nature Commun.* **5** (2014).
16. X. Ma, B. Dakic, W. Naylor, A. Zeilinger & P. Walther. Quantum simulation of the wavefunction to probe frustrated Heisenberg spin systems. *Nature Phys.* **7**, 399–405 (2011).
17. I. Pitsios *et al.* Photonic simulation of entanglement growth after a spin chain quench. *arXiv:1603.02669* (2016).
18. M. H. M. Olsson, J. Mavri & A. Warshel. Transition state theory can be used in studies of enzyme catalysis: lessons from simulations of tunnelling and dynamical effects in lipoxxygenase and other systems. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., B, Biol. Sci.* **361**, 1417–1432 (2006).
19. D. Lidar, D. Lidar & H. Wang. Calculating the thermal rate constant with exponential speedup on a quantum computer. *Phys. Rev. E* **59**, 2429–2438 (1999).
20. A. Y. Kitaev. Quantum measurements and the Abelian Stabilizer Problem. *Electronic colloquium on computational complexity*, 22 (1995).
21. M. Dobsicek, G. Johansson, V. Shumeiko & G. Wendin. Arbitrary accuracy iterative quantum phase estimation algorithm using a single ancillary qubit: A two-qubit benchmark. *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 030306 (3 2007).
22. J. R. McClean, J. Romero, R. Babbush & A. Aspuru-Guzik. The theory of variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms. *New J. Phys.* **18**, 023023 (2016).
23. J. R. McClean, M. E. Schwartz, J. Carter & W. A. de Jong. Hybrid quantum-classical hierarchy for mitigation of decoherence and determination of excited states. *arXiv*, 1603.05681 (2016).
24. D. Bonneau, J. W. Silverstone & M. G. Thompson. in: *Silicon Photonics III: Systems and Applications* (eds L. Pavesi & D. J. Lockwood) 41–82 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2016).
25. J. E. Sharping *et al.* Generation of correlated photons in nanoscale silicon waveguides. *Opt. Express* **14**, 12388–12393 (2006).
26. J. W. Silverstone *et al.* On-chip quantum interference between silicon photon-pair sources. *Nature Photon.* **8**, 104–108 (2013).
27. D. Grassani *et al.* Micrometer-scale integrated silicon source of time-energy entangled photons. *Optica* **2**, 88–94 (2015).

28. J. W. Silverstone *et al.* Qubit entanglement between ring-resonator photon-pair sources on a silicon chip. *Nature Commun.* **6**, 7948 (2015).
29. J. Wang *et al.* Chip-to-chip quantum photonic interconnect by path-polarization interconversion. *Optica* **3**, 407–413 (2016).
30. W. H. P. Pernice *et al.* High-speed and high-efficiency travelling wave single-photon detectors embedded in nanophotonic circuits. *Nature Commun.* **3**, 1325 (2012).
31. F. Najafi *et al.* On-chip detection of non-classical light by scalable integration of single-photon detectors. *Nature Commun.* **6**, 5873 (2015).
32. L. Sansoni *et al.* Polarization Entangled State Measurement on a Chip. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 200503 (20 2010).
33. X. Zhou *et al.* Adding control to arbitrary unknown quantum operations. *Nature Commun.* **2**, 413–8 (2011).
34. R. B. Patel, J. Ho, F. Ferreyrol, T. C. Ralph & G. J. Pryde. A quantum Fredkin gate. *Sci. Adv.* **2**, e1501531 (2016).
35. D. Wecker, M. B. Hastings & M. Troyer. Progress towards practical quantum variational algorithms. *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 042303 (2015).
36. T. Helgaker, P. Jorgensen & J. Olsen. *Molecular electronic-structure theory* (John Wiley & Sons, 2014).
37. R. J. Cogdell, A. Gall & J. Köhler. The architecture and function of the light-harvesting apparatus of purple bacteria: from single molecules to in vivo membranes. *Quarterly Reviews of Biophysics* **39**, 227–324 (2006).
38. J. Carolan *et al.* Universal linear optics. *Science* **349**, 711–716 (2015).
39. R. Barends *et al.* Superconducting quantum circuits at the surface code threshold for fault tolerance. *Nature* **508**, 500–503 (2014).
40. S. Debnath *et al.* Demonstration of a small programmable quantum computer with atomic qubits. *Nature* **536**, 63–66 (2016).
41. J. Salfi *et al.* Quantum simulation of the Hubbard model with dopant atoms in silicon. *Nature Commun.* **7**, 11342 (2016).

Acknowledgements

We thank C. Sparrow, A. Montanaro, A. Laing, E. Johnston and J. Barreto for useful discussion and feedback. We thank W. Andrew Murray and Magnus Loutit for experimental support. We thank K. Ohira, N. Suzuki, H. Yoshida, N. Iizuka and M. Ezaki for the device fabrication. We thank S. Miki, T. Yamashita, M. Fujiwara, M. Sasaki, H. Terai, M. G. Tanner, C. M. Natarajan and R. H. Hadfield for the SPSPDs used for part of the characterization of the device. We acknowledge the support from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), European Research Council (ERC), Photonic Integrated Compound Quantum Encoding (PICQUE), FP7 Action: Beyond the Barriers of Optical Integration (BBOI), FET-ProActive: Quantum Simulation on a Photonic Chip (QuChip), US Army Research Office (ARO), and Centre for Nanoscience and Quantum Information (NSQI). J.R.M. is supported by the Luis W. Alvarez fellowship under LDRD funding from Berkeley Lab, provided by the Director, Office of Science, of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231. S.M.S. was supported by the Bristol Quantum Engineering Centre for Doctoral Training, EPSRC grant EP/L015730/1. X.Z. acknowledges support from the National Key R & D Program (Grant No.2016YFA0301700), the National Young 1000 Talents Plan and Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong (2016A030312012). J.L.O'B. acknowledges a Royal Society Wolfson Merit Award and a Royal Academy of Engineering Chair in Emerging Technologies. M.G.T. acknowledges the support from an EPSRC Early Career Fellowship and the Toshiba Research Fellowship scheme.

Author contributions

R.S. and J.W. contributed equally to this work. R.S., J.W., D.B., X.Z. and M.G.T. designed the experiment. R.S., J.W., S.P., A.A.G., N.W., J.R.M. and X.Z. developed the algorithm. R.S., A.A.G., N.W. and J.R.M. performed simulations. R.S., J.W., S.P., A.A.G. and J.W.S. performed the experiment, with theoretical support from N.W., J.R.M, S.M-S, P.J.S. and D.P.T. N.W. developed the new theoretical results shown in SI. R.S., J.W., S.P., A.A.G., N.W. and J.R.M. wrote the manuscript with feedback from all authors. J.L.O'B. and M.G.T. managed the project.